

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is responsive to an Office Action mailed on November 15, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, and 34 are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Patent Application

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, and 34 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, 33, and 34 have been rejected. Claims 4-8, 10, 14-18, 20, 24-28, 30, and 32 have been withdrawn due to restriction requirement. Claims 2, 9, 12, 19, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 have been amended.

Response to the Drawing Objection

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) due to the lack of showing a motor as specified in the claims. Claims 9, 19, 29, and 33 have been cancelled rendering this objection moot.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bancroft (U.S. Patent No. 427,217). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claim1

Independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that Bancroft does not disclose, teach, or suggest any of the following:

- 1) "a housing ... having a stationary top serving as a stop",
- 2) "a support assembly for supporting the at least one electronic component ... in the normal operating position that is at a downwardly inclined angle at least partially within the interior of said housing permitting the operation of the component",
- 3) "a drawer having a pair of upstanding side walls and an upstanding rear wall, the upstanding walls having a vertical height substantially equal to the vertical height of the angled opening", and
- 4) "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the interior of the stationary top of the housing adjacent to the opening to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position"

1) "a housing ... having a stationary top serving as a stop"

Bancroft does not teach, suggest, or disclose "a housing ... having a stationary top serving as a stop." Bancroft discloses "a cover 5, which consists of the sections 5^a and 5^b, hinged to each other and hinged to the case at 6" at col. 1, lines 32-35. The doubly hinged cover of Bancroft is a movable top, not "a stationary top", and could not function as "a stop". Furthermore, the movement of the cover is a vital and indispensable feature of the typewriter cabinet of Bancroft. Therefore, Bancroft does not disclose "a housing ... having a stationary top serving as a stop."

- 2) *"a support assembly for supporting the at least one electronic component ... in the normal operating position that is at a downwardly inclined angle at least partially within the interior of said housing permitting the operation of the component"*

Bancroft does not teach, suggest, or disclose "a support assembly for supporting the at least one electronic component ... in the normal operating position that is at a downwardly inclined angle at least partially within the interior of said housing permitting the operation of the component." Bancroft discloses the use of the typewriter in an access position or generally horizontal position. Bancroft merely discloses storing the typewriter in an inclined position with the cover 5 hiding the typewriter from view. Using the typewriter in the inclined position of Bancroft would be not only awkward, at best, but impossible due to the movement of the carriage and the movement of the paper through the carriage. Therefore, Bancroft does not disclose "a support assembly for supporting the at least one electronic component ... in the normal operating position that is at a downwardly inclined angle at least partially within the interior of said housing permitting the operation of the component."

- 3) *"a drawer having a pair of upstanding side walls and an upstanding rear wall, the upstanding walls having a vertical height substantially equal to the vertical height of the angled opening"*

Bancroft does not teach, suggest, or disclose "a drawer having a pair of upstanding side walls and an upstanding rear wall, the upstanding walls having a vertical height substantially equal to the vertical height of the angled opening." Bancroft merely discloses a movable platform 9, not a drawer. As shown in FIGS. 2 and 4, the platform 9 does not include any upstanding walls. In fact, a projection 14 is provided to engage the upper side of the platform 9 to prevent it from tilting over projection 13, and upstanding walls on platform 9 would interfere with this function. Therefore, Bancroft does not disclose "a drawer having a pair of upstanding side walls and an upstanding rear wall, the upstanding walls having a vertical height substantially equal to the vertical height of the angled opening."

- 4) "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the interior of the stationary top of the housing adjacent to the opening to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position"

Bancroft does not teach, suggest, or disclose "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the interior of the stationary top of the housing adjacent to the opening to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position." Bancroft merely discloses a movable platform 9, but the movable platform 9 does not include "a top portion for engaging the interior of the stationary top." In fact, the movable platform 9 engages a projection 14, not the cover 5 of the Bancroft device, and since the cover 5 is hinged it would not operate as a stop as shown in FIG. 7 when the cover 5 moves during the rotation of arm 7 when contacted by bar 12. Therefore, Bancroft does not disclose "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the interior of the stationary top of the housing adjacent to the opening to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position."

Accordingly, the rejection is deficient in these areas. Notwithstanding, the undersigned has reviewed the entirety of the Bancroft patent and has failed to identify any such teachings anywhere within this reference. Accordingly, the Bancroft patent fails to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 11

Independent claim 11 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1. Accordingly, the Bancroft patent fails to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 11, and the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 21

Independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1. Accordingly, the Bancroft patent fails to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 21, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bancroft in view of Price, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,199,773). Claims 2 and 12 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 31 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bancroft. Independent claim 31 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1 and the rejection of claim 31 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 19, 29, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bancroft in view of Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,797,666). Claims 9, 19, and 29 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot. Claim 33 is allowable along with its independent claim 31 for the same reasons as mentioned above in connection with the discussion of claim 31 as amended.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 3, 13, 22-23, and 34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, respectively. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

The other cited art of record has been reviewed, and it is believed that the claims, as amended, patentably distinguish thereover.

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that now pending claims 1, 11, 21, 23, 31, and 34 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the

opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 619-209-3063.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2007

DUCKOR SPRADLING METZGER & WYNNE
A Law Corporation
3043 4th Avenue
San Diego, California 92103-5801

Telephone No.: 619.209.3000
Facsimile No.: 619.209.3043
Email Address: kleinke@dsmwlaw.com

By:



Bernard L. Kleinke
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,123